Several people have asked for my take on the extra Cainan in verse 36, and while we’re about it there are two bothersome bits in verse 33. So here goes.

**Cainan²—Luke 3:36 X Genesis 11:12**

There are several spelling variations that together are attested by almost 1% of the MSS; 99% have Kainan. Apparently only two omit, P75v and D, but no printed text follows their lead. So there is no reasonable doubt that Luke in fact wrote that Shelah was fathered by Cainan, not Arphaxad. This Cainan has been widely used to justify treating the genealogies in Genesis like accordions—if one name was demonstrably left out in the Genesis account, then who knows how many others were also left out. This Cainan is also used to deny the validity of constructing a strict chronology based on the time spans given in the genealogies.

But where did Luke get this information? The LXX contains Cainan in Genesis 11:12, but is so different from the Massoretic text here that it looks like fiction. Recall that the LXX we know is based on codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, produced centuries after Luke. It is more likely that our LXX is based on Luke than vice versa. Where then did Luke get it? I understand that Luke obtained the information about this Cainan from records existing in his day, and being correct information was led by the Holy Spirit to include it in his Gospel. Just like Jude, who quoted Enoch—Enoch’s prophecy must have been in existence in Jude’s day, but we have no copy in Hebrew today (though Jews are reported to have used one so recently as the 13th century A.D.); similarly we have no copy of Luke’s source.¹

This brief note was inspired by the discussion of the subject given by Dr. Floyd N. Jones in *Chronology of the Old Testament*² (which book comes close to solving all the alleged numerical discrepancies in the OT, at least as I see it). However, the explanation that follows is original with me (if anyone else has proposed it, I am unaware). Let’s recall the exact wording of Genesis 11:12-13. “Arphaxad lived thirty-five years and begot Salah; after he begot Salah, Arphaxad lived four hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters.”³

The verb ‘begot’ requires that Salah be a blood descendent of Arphaxad, not adopted. He could be a grandson, the son of a son of Arphaxad, or even a great-grandson, etc., except that in this case the time frame only has room for one intervening generation. The plain meaning of the formula in the Text, ‘W lived X years and begot Y; after W begot Y he lived Z years,’ is it not?

Let’s try to imagine the situation in the years immediately following the Flood. After the Flood the ‘name of the game’ was to replenish the earth. Indeed, the divine command was: “Be fruitful and multiply”

---

¹ Let’s recall Luke’s stated purpose in writing: “It seemed good to me also, most excellent Theophilus, having taken careful note of everything from Above, to write to you with precision and in sequence, so that you may know the certainty of the things in which you were instructed” (Luke 1:3-4). Given his stated purpose in writing, Luke’s account needs to be historically accurate (cf. 2:2 and 3:1). So then, I take it that the Holy Spirit guided Luke to include Cainan²; I will argue the same for Joram below. While I’m on this tack, my solution to the ‘Jeremiah’ problem in Matthew 27:9-10 is similar. Daniel (9:2) refers to “the books” (plural) in connection with Jeremiah the prophet. So I assume that Matthew had access to other writings of Jeremiah, of which no copy survives.

² *Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Basics* (Floyd Nolen Jones, The Woodlands, TX: Kings Word Press, 1999, pp. 29-36). (This is the 14th edition, revised and enlarged—the 1st came out in 1993.) I imagine that many readers may feel uncomfortable with the author’s very dogmatic way of expressing himself, but I would urge them to filter out the rhetorical style and concentrate on the substantial arguments, that are of extraordinary value. For example, his solution to the conundrum of the reigns of the kings on the two sides of the divided monarchy is simply brilliant, and to my mind obviously correct, leaving no loose ends. (In this connection, he debunks the claims of Edwin R. Thiele and William F. Albright.)

³ It follows that this formula destroys the ‘accordion’ gambit. There were precisely 130 years between Adam and Seth, 105 between Seth and Enosh, 90 between Enosh and Cainan¹, etc., etc.
(Gen. 9:1). So, whom could Noah’s grandsons marry? Obviously their cousins, Noah’s granddaughters. There would be an urgency to reproduce—thus, the girls would be married off at puberty, and the boys wouldn’t be wasting around either. The women would be giving birth as often as they possibly could. Really, the absolute top priority would be to increase the number of people.

Arphaxad was born two years after the flood, but his wife could have been born a year or two earlier. (The Sacred Text is clear to the effect that only eight souls entered the ark, but some of the women could have conceived during the Flood.) Thus, Arphaxad could have fathered “Cainan” when he was 17/18. Similarly, Cainan could have fathered Salah when he was 17/18. In this way Arphaxad could be said to have “begotten” Salah when he was 35. Cainan could have died early or been passed over in Genesis because the time span did not constitute a ‘generation’, or both. Or, as things got back to normal, culturally speaking, the haste with which Arphaxad and Cainan procreated might have been viewed as unseemly. The expedient of omitting Cainan would make the account more ‘normal’ while preserving precision as to the elapsed time.

But Luke would be correct in saying that Salah was “of” Cainan who was “of” Arphaxad. Salah was Arphaxad’s grandson. In any case, the Messianic line was passed on by Salah. Without Luke’s record I, for one, would never have stopped to consider what must have happened immediately following the Flood—the absolute priority must have been to increase the number of people.

The fictitious Arni and Admin (alias ‘Idi Amin’)

of Aminadab of Aram

του Αµιναδαβ, του Αδµιν, του Αρνι — none!!
of Aminadab of Admin of Arni

του Αδµειν, του Αρνι — B
of Admin of Arni

tου Αδειμ, του Αρνι — syg

tου Αρηι — P, L

The ‘Alexandrian’ witnesses are scattered all over the back side of the desert—almost no two agree. One would have thought that this would give the UBS editors pause, but not at all. They were so intent on doing despite to Christ’s genealogy that they actually concocted a ‘patchwork quilt’ and intruded the fictitious Admin and Arni into that genealogy. UBS has presented the evidence in their apparatus in such a way as to obscure the fact that no Greek MS has the precise text they have printed (the same holds for N-A). In Metzger’s presentation of the UBS Committee’s reasoning in this case he writes, “the Committee adopted what seems to be the least unsatisfactory form of text”. Is this not a good candidate for ‘chutzpah’ of the year? The UBS editors concoct their own reading and proclaim it “the least unsatisfactory”! And just what might be “unsatisfactory” about the reading of 97% of the MSS except that it doesn’t introduce any difficulties?

There is complete confusion in the Egyptian camp. That confusion must have commenced in the second century, resulting from several easy transcriptional errors, simple copying mistakes. APAM to APNI is

---

4 There are a number of further variations, including a variety of conflations and spellings.
very easy (in the early centuries only upper case letters were used); with a scratchy quill the cross strokes in the \( A \) and \( M \) could be light, and a subsequent copyist could mistake the left leg of the \( M \) as going with the \( \Lambda \) to make \( N \), and the right leg of the \( M \) would become \( I \). Very early “Aminadab” was misspelled as “Aminadam”, which survives in some 25% of the extant MSS. The “Adam” of Aleph, syr\(^5\) and cop\(^{sa}\) arose through an easy instance of homoioarcton (the eye of a copyist went from the first \( A \) in “Aminadam” to the second, dropping “Amin-” and leaving “Adam”). \( A \) and \( \Delta \) are easily confused, especially when written by hand—“Admin” presumably came from “AMINadab/m”, though the process was more complicated. The “i” of “Admin” and “Arni” is corrupted to “ei” in Codex B (a frequent occurrence in that MS—perhaps due to Coptic influence). Codex Aleph conflated the ancestor that produced “Adam” with the one that produced “Admin”, etc. The total confusion in Egypt does not surprise us, but how shall we account for the text and apparatus of UBS\(^3\)/N-A\(^{26}\) in this instance? And whatever possessed the editors of NASB, NRSV, TEV, LB, Berkeley, etc. to embrace such an egregious error?

‘Admin’ and ‘Arni’ have no more place in Christ’s genealogy than does Idi Amin, although he at least is not a fiction.

**Joram—Luke 3:33 X Mt. 1:3, Ruth 4:19, 1 Chron. 2:9**

Luke 3:33 offers yet another textual difficulty. Does ‘Joram’ belong between Aram and Hezron, or doesn’t he? This time the evidence is seriously divided; it looks like this:

\[
tou \ iwram \ f^{35} \text{[75%]} \ \text{Lect.},it^{b},sy^{b} \ || \ --- \ a,A,B,D \text{[25%]} \ \text{lat},sy^{b},cop
\]

The Old Latin \( b \) gives ‘Joram’ overt 5th century attestation, and I have argued elsewhere that \( f^{35} \) goes back to the 3rd, at least\(^7\) (and the Lectionary system is ancient as well). So both variants are ancient. The apparent disagreement with Matthew, Ruth and Chronicles would be an obvious inducement to omit ‘Joram’. But what possible motivation would there be to invent and insert an unknown name? And if someone did, how could it come to dominate the stream of transmission?

The percentages are based on a thorough comparison of TuT\(^8\) and the IGNTP Luke,\(^9\) I venture to affirm that the absolute minimum for the omission (should complete collations ever become available) will be 21%, and the maximum 26%. I think that the real probability is around 23%, but I rounded up to 25%, so as not to be accused of ‘stacking the deck’ in favor of my choice. So then, given my presuppositions, the external evidence is compelling (the probabilities of the case happen to join in). But wherever could Luke have come up with ‘Joram’? As I have argued above, I assume he had access to records of which no copy survives; given his stated purpose to be historically precise, he was led by the Holy Spirit to include Joram. So then, Aram (Ram) was actually a grandson of Hezron; Hezron fathered Joram, who fathered Aram.

---

\(^6\) UBS\(^3\)/N-A\(^{27}\) have the text of the prior edition, the differences being in the apparatus; with reference to this variant set the apparatus remains basically the same in both editions.

\(^7\) “The Dating of \( K \) (alias \( f^{49} \), see \( f^{48} \)) Revisited” and “When is a Recension?”. (See also “Concerning the Text of the Pericope Adulterae” and “My Pilgrimage toward \( f^{35} = K = M \) in the PA and M\(^{c}\) in Revelation”.)

\(^8\) *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Ed. Kurt Aland, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), volumes 30 and 31. They collated a total of 1,756 MSS (they list a further 31 MSS that did not contain any of the chosen variant sets—they give 1,787 as the number of all known continuous text Greek MSS for Luke) for a select number of variant sets—54 such sets in Luke.

\(^9\) *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Ed. The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). This edition includes 8 papyri, 62 uncials and 128 (127) cursives, for a total of 197 Greek MSS (including fragments). The committee selected the 128 minuscule MSS it collated for the project by means of the Claremont Profile Method, evidently covering most (if not all) of von Soden’s sub-groups. For any given verse the number of extant MSS will be around 150.